

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 11, 2008. Claims 1 to 23 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 10 and 12 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,206,804 (Deshpande). Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Deshpande and U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0033837 (Munro). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of displaying a digital image for creating a multimedia content, the image being coded in multiple resolutions. The method includes a step of determining the set of resolutions present in the coded image; a step of obtaining the coded data of the sub-images associated with each of the resolutions determined during the determining step, wherein the obtaining step includes a step of extracting from the coded image all the data necessary to decode all resolutions; a step of decoding the obtained coded data, before displaying any sub-image, so as to obtain a sub-image associated with each previously determined resolution; and a step of displaying all the sub-images.

Applicant respectfully submits that the applied reference, namely Deshpande, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claim 1. In particular, Deshpande is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of determining the set of resolutions present in a coded image, obtaining coded data of sub-images associated with each of determined resolution, including a step of extracting from the coded image all the data necessary to decode all resolutions, decoding the obtained coded data, before displaying any sub-image, so as to

obtain a sub-image associated with each previously determined resolution and displaying all the sub-images.

In contrast to the present invention, Deshpande describes a method and system for transmitting digital images, wherein image data encoded using JPEG2000, which is a scalable encoding format, are transmitted from a server to a client via the HTTP protocol. According to Deshpande, an index file can be downloaded by the client, for example from a Web server. The index file may contain information about an image, for example taken from the main header. (See Deshpande, column 4, lines 11 to 14). The index file may also comprise information on the available resolutions.

A thumbnail image is also transmitted to the client. Then the client can zoom so as to receive a higher resolution of the same image (see, for example, Figures 9 and 10). The thumbnail image and a higher resolution image are represented on the same display window. As specified by Deshpande (column 12, lines 35 to 37), the client application “requests the data needed at the desired resolution and displays the higher-resolution image 116 to the user in graphics window 110.” However, Deshpande is not seen to disclose or suggest that all the possible resolutions available to a user for displaying a digital image included in the multimedia content previously created by another user are displayed to the user by determining the set of resolutions present in a coded image, obtaining coded data of sub-images associated with each of determined resolution, including a step of extracting from the coded image all the data necessary to decode all resolutions, decoding the obtained coded data, before displaying any sub-image, so as to obtain a sub-image associated with each previously determined resolution and displaying all the sub-images, as featured in Claim 1.

In one aspect of the invention, all available resolutions are simultaneously displayed (Figure 3b). In another aspect of the invention, the switch from one resolution to another can be done by clicking on a "watermark" window.

Furthermore, Munro discloses a method in which a multiple-image viewer concurrently displays and manipulates separate images in a single window in a network system. The problem solved in Munro, as expressed in paragraphs [0004] and [0005], is that in most client-server systems, images are displayed separately, each in a different window, which might be impractical for a user.

Munro's multiple-image viewer supports displaying images having multiple levels of resolution. The file structure described for the storage of multiple resolutions contains several sub-pictures at various resolutions (paragraph [0048]). It is mentioned that the multiple-image viewer automatically determines which blocks are within the window and only requests and decodes those blocks of data (paragraph [0049]). Also, in paragraph [0046], it is specified that "if for example the user zooms in on an image above the predetermined setting, then the multiple-image viewer would request for the next higher resolution of the image."

Therefore, Munro discloses the possibility of displaying simultaneously in the same window several resolution levels, but Munro does not disclose the features of determining the set of resolutions present in a coded image, obtaining coded data of sub-images associated with each of determined resolution, including a step of extracting from the coded image all the data necessary to decode all resolutions, decoding the obtained coded data, before displaying any sub-image, so as to obtain a sub-image associated with each previously determined resolution and displaying all the sub-images as featured in Claim 1.

In light of these deficiencies in Deshpande and Munro, Applicants submit that

these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Claim 9 is directed to an apparatus substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 9 is also in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### CONCLUSION

The Director is authorized to charge the \$490 extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-3939.

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS\_WS 2754063v1